

REMARKS**§ 112 Rejections**

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards (or Applicants regard) as the invention.

The amendment to claim 7 is believed to overcome this rejection.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 7-10 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama (US 6306948).

The Examiner has acknowledged that Yokoyama (US 6306948) does not teach a flexible mold including a base layer made of a first and second curable material as set forth in Claim 11, and therefore Yokoyama (US 6306948) fails to teach all the claim limitations.

Claims 7-10 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosaka (US 5992320) in view of Yokoyama (US 6306948) and Kinzer (US 5453450).

Claims 11-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosaka (US 5992320) in view of Kinzer (US 5453450).

The Examiner stated that, “Kosaka teaches providing a mold having a groove pattern . . . including a base layer of a first cured material and a second cured material disposed on the surface of the base layer (25:58-61, 26:47 and Figs. 18 (a)-(e)).”

The Examiner further states that Kosaka does not specifically teach the a first curable material having a viscosity of 3,000 to 100,000 cps and a second curable material having a viscosity of less than 200 cps.

The Examiner has taken the position that the photocurable adhesive of Kosaka would have the viscosity of the first curable material based on the teachings of Kinzer and that the second curable material would have a viscosity of less than 200 cps based on column 26, lines 33-35 that states, “. . . it is preferable to use an ink that is liquid at normal temperature.”

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their representative during the personal interview of June 19, 2007. During the interview, Applicant's representative explained that Figs. 18 (a)-(c) depicts a method of making barrier ribs on a glass substrate and not a method of making a flexible mold.

Figure 18b describes coating a photocurable ink layer 13 on the surface of the intaglio 60 (formed of a metal or glass plate as described at column 25, line 57) having release agent layer 19. "Then as depicted in Figure 18c, a **glass substrate 14** is pressed on the coated ink layer 13 with a photocurable adhesive 21 sandwiched between them. In this state, the stack is exposed to ultraviolet rays using the mask 22 corresponding to the depressions 60a. By this exposure only the ink layer 13 with the depressions 60a and only the adhesive on the depressions 60a are cured." . . . "Subsequent releasing of the glass substrate 14 from the intaglio 60 causes the ink layer 13 to be transferred onto the glass substrate 14 as depicted in Fig. 18(d)." . . . Finally, the **substrate is overall fired to bring the ink layer into close contact with the substrate.**"

During the Interview, Applicant's representative argued that since the glass substrate together with the transferred ink layer is "fired", the ink layer is necessarily an ink layer used as a resistor or barrier layer composed of an inorganic component comprising at least glass frit and a resinous component that is to be removed by firing, as described at column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 3 of Kosaka. Accordingly, this ink layer is similar to Applicant's "rib precursor".

The Applicant submits that Figs. 18(a) – 18(e) of Kosaka do not meet the claim limitations of independent claims 7 or 11, as well as new claims 21-23. Fig. 18(e) having glass barrier ribs 13 bonded to a glass substrate 14 by means of adhesive 21 is not a "flexible mold". The intaglio 60 of Figs. 18(a) – 18(e) is not a "flexible mold" either. A glass or metal plate is not flexible, i.e. the ordinary meaning of the term flexible - "capable of being bent or flexed." In addition, a glass substrate is also not a support "film".

The Applicant also submits that the fact that something is a "liquid" does not necessitate a viscosity of less than 200 cps. In fact, both the first and second curable material are liquids . . . a high viscosity liquid as the first curable material and a low viscosity liquid as the second curable material. Accordingly, there is no basis to conclude that Kosaka teaches Applicant's second curable material.

New claim 24, a preferred embodiment, also differs from Figs. 18(a) – 18(c) of Kosaka, since the cited references fail to teach that “during lamination the second curable material is replaced by the first curable material” as explained on p. 9, lines 5-11 and depicted for example in Figs. 2, 4E, and 5 of Applicant’s patent application.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

August 30, 2007

Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833